

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 CUNG LE, et al.,

8 Plaintiffs,

9 v.

10 ZUFFA, LLC, et al.,

11 Defendants.

Case No. 2:15-cv-01045-RFB-PAL

ORDER

(Mots to Seal)

(ECF Nos. 398, 403, 411, 416, 419, 425)

12 The court conducted a hearing on June 1, 2017, on numerous matters, including Plaintiff's
13 Motion to Compel Defendant to Produce a Log of Communications for Dana White's Discoverable
14 Telephone Numbers and Electronic Communication Devices and Directing Defendant to Submit
15 an Inventory of Electronic Communication Devices (ECF No. 395), and Plaintiffs' Motion to
16 Extend Duration of Depositions for Certain Zuffa Executives (ECF No. 414). Numerous Motions
17 to Seal (ECF Nos. 398, 403, 411, 416, 419, 425) were filed in connection to the briefing of these
18 motions pursuant to the Protective Order issued by this court on February 10, 2016 (ECF No. 217).

19 The motions, responses, replies, and supporting exhibits and declarations filed on the
20 public record were heavily redacted, and numerous motions to seal were filed requesting that
21 redacted briefs, declarations and exhibits filed under seal remain redacted and sealed on the public
22 record. Plaintiffs' motions to seal are based on their obligation to file documents produced in
23 discovery which opposing counsel marked as confidential pursuant to the protective order and
24 amended protective order governing confidentiality entered in this case. Defendants' motions to
25 seal are based on arguments the redacted portions of the briefs and supporting declarations, and
26 exhibits filed under seal, are confidential and entitled to protection from public disclosure on
27 various grounds.
28

Hundreds of pages were filed in connection with the moving and responsive papers involved in these motions. The court lacks the time and the resources to determine, on a line-by-line, page-by-page, and document-by-document basis whether the parties have shown good cause for each and every redaction and sealed document. The court finds that the documents filed on the public record, coupled with the hearing transcript which describes the parties' disputes complies with the holdings of the Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit which create a presumption of public access to judicial files and records. These are non-dispositive motions, and the parties' publically filed papers and hearing transcript accomplishes the objective of providing public access.

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The parties' Motions to Seal (ECF Nos. 398, 403, 411, 416, 425) related to the Motion to Compel (ECF No. 395) are **GRANTED**.
2. Plaintiffs' Motion to Seal (ECF No. 419) as it relates to the Motion to Extend Duration of Depositions (ECF No. 414) is **GRANTED**.

DATED this 13th day of June, 2017.

Peggy A. Leen
PEGGY A. LEEN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE